_

Second thing, what Mr. Roberts had to say about his own arc of business diversity is such a great example: Own television stations, use that as a jumping off point to get into wireless.

Now, everyone on the outside kind of looks at the Commission these days and thinks it's all about broadband and not about broadcasting.

But this is the heritage technology that minorities and women got into the communications business with.

And again and again -- and we work in all of those spaces. In the broadband space, you'd be surprised how many people learned this business through radio operations or ownership, or television operations or ownership. Or got into wireless exactly this way. That's the natural arc of technological diversity.

So if you cut off access to these heritage, start-up industries for many people who have diversified careers, what you're doing is basically putting the agency in the position where

1 in new industries, it's going to wake up one 2 morning and say, "Why isn't this diverse? Why doesn't this look like America?" Because you cut 3 4 off the route in. 5 MS. BAUTISTA: Just, the behavioral 6 change, I always believe in going outside the box. 7 And I mentioned the technical assistance and 8 capacity-building. 9 You know, how about this big media 10 creating a pilot program, creating a fund to teach

You know, how about this big media creating a pilot program, creating a fund to teach how to run this business properly, and how to work with FCC -- I guess you have, there's a lot of bureaucracy, and very, very slow, you know. So how can we adapt to that?

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So how about teaching them, so eventually they will own one and do it properly. So creating a small-business technical assistance and capacity-building for them.

MR. REED: Thank you. I've got a follow-up question on the foreign ownership issue. In the transportation context, you know I've done some work in the past on ownership credits, or on

percentage of ownership. And at least in the transportation arena, part of the concern is whether or not the percentages actually reflect real management by minorities.

And if you all have any comments with respect to that, if whether the foreign ownership rules sort of impact that issue? And if there's a counter-argument to it?

MR. HONIG: Do we want to have the possibility of ownership fraud involving people who aren't within our borders? Or do you want to have no ownership, and a little bit -- the same percentage of ownership fraud by people within our borders?

There's a long history of -- the

Commission has a long history, you remember, from
the comparative hearing days. I did a study on
this about 20-something years ago. Found that
maybe about a third of applicants holding
themselves out as minority and women-controlled
applicants really weren't. But you know what?

Two-thirds of them were. And that was better than

zero, which is what we had before the Commission started this practice.

1.3

There was attrition, but the fact that something isn't perfect isn't a reason not to do it.

MR. REED: Anyone else?

MR. ROBERTS: I agree with him.

Essentially -- and first of all, I mean, if you look at the forms of media that exist today, it's coming from all over the world, anyway. All over the world. Whether it's hitting on your laptop or on your -- through cable TV.

So when are we going to move into the global economy, as the FCC? I mean, I understand the concept of people who would argue that we should build a wall between the United States and Mexico, but I don't necessarily agree that that is the way to do it, nor do I agree that for us to think that the only way for us to progress in this country is to limit ourselves and restrict a voice that now would be ostensibly global.

And I think the natural outcome of that

is that you'll have a diversity in employment, in management, and in ownership.

MR. REED: You know, that actually brings me to a kind of a segue into a question that was asked in the prior panel about defining diversity. That's one of the issues that we face here, is how precisely does the Commission look at what diversity means in the marketplace?

Should we be looking at it in terms of diversity as a means to an end? That being the type of content that's provided through our media outlets? Or are we looking at diversity as an end in itself, diversity of ownership?

I'd like to hear your thoughts on that?

MS. BAUTISTA: Diversity, to me, is

corporate responsibility. Not just ownership, but

also the senior management and their philanthropy,

and their supplier diversity.

Who are their customers? The receipts that they get are usually from minorities, and I think they should give back to the minority.

Their senior management should be minority.

This is what I'm so passionate about.

Of all the 6,000 Boards of Directors, there are only two Filipinos? Two Vietnamese? And we're the highest educated people?

No. Where's the diversity? Diversity is not just about your color and my color. It's your DNA, your corporate responsibility, the public interest.

And I'm so glad you're having this hearing. And thank you for including me. Because I don't think we've ever really been part of this.

I encourage more of that public participation. And I'm glad Commissioner Clyburn went to San Diego. I mean, I applaud her for that. The same thing with Commission Baker and Chairman Genachowski. But at the same time, they give two-day notice. So how many people can come? It's usually either the lobbyists or the corporations.

I mean, you really need to hear from the grassroots, from the community. To me, that's diversity. Include everyone. Listen to the Main

Street.

MR. REED: David?

MR. HONIG: The question of whether it's for its own sake or to promote content diversity at the consumer level -- it's both.

Of course what we want is a process by which owners who we trust, under the structure of the Communications Act, to ultimately control what goes over their airways, to be diverse -- because that's going to lead, as studies have again and again shown, to diversity in terms of opinions that are available to the public, in terms of agendas of issues that get presented to the public, and in terms of diversity of culture.

But more than that, let's suppose that this was an industry of common carriers. Would diversity of ownership still be important? Of course, it would -- because of its value in promoting efficiency and in promoting competition by allowing everyone to have an opportunity to fully monetize their inherent assets that are distributed equally among all people.

That means, for example -- and the way that it works in practice, I thought it was fascinating that Mr. Roberts' company, most of the employees are, 98 percent minorities and women?

MR. ROBERTS: That's right.

MR. HONIG: Not a lot of companies can point to that. That's something that happens in the normal course in most minority— and women—owned companies. It means that people who wouldn't get an opportunity to work in many places at all get this opportunity here.

And it means that -- there's one other thing that people don't remember, and that's -- you remember Andrew Bremmer's study in 1995 about the impact of discrimination on the macro economy? A dollar circulated in the African- American community circulates seven times. Only twice if it is not. So it gets used to build the community as a whole, which benefits all of society immensely.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I used to be an entrepreneur, and that's when you're building your

companies for your family. But now I'm a solid capitalist.

And as a capitalist, I'm trying to build generationally. And by building generationally in a capitalistic nation, you set examples, many examples. And those examples will be at schools where you might speak, or just in the community.

You see, our offices are still on Dr.

Martin Luther King and King's Highway. And

anybody who knows, if I use the term "Dr. Martin

Luther King Boulevard," they know the nature of

the neighborhood just by the concept of that name.

We set examples. You see our dishes on the roof of our building. I mean, I have to believe that when those students come through and they point to us as owners of our TV stations, it has to have an impact on those inner-city kids when they see it. I just believe that.

And I've had young people come along years later to suggest the fact that now that they're in that business -- I still get calls, "How do I get in the business?"

Now, one of the questions that I may ask of you is, if -- we have now turned in our analog signals, that's still spectrum out there. You know, to what extent are you planning to make sure that women and minorities are able to activate some of that spectrum in a fashion that's going to work and make money in our capitalistic system?

This is going to be an interesting challenge I'm putting to you. Because you have the spectrum of every television station in the United States and our protectorates -- all of those licenses and all of that spectrum. How are you going to now convert that analog spectrum to an economic model that women and minorities will be able to enjoy and exploit?

MR. REED: David, you alluded to this a moment ago in talking about the data that's out there on, really, the nexus between ownership and content diversity.

And do you think that the data is there, or is there something else that we have to do to measure that nexus? And if so, what?

MR. HONIG: There have been studies on this going back -- in fact, Mr. Justice Brennan's last opinion, in Metro Broadcasting, cites about two pages of those studies in footnotes and in the text of that opinion. And that was in 1989. And studies continue to be done in the academy, and the Commission has done, I think, one in 2000, but none since.

Here, if it's going to be necessary -and it will be -- to defend Commission rules that
may, if it finds, as I think it ultimately will
have to, that some race-conscious rules are going
to be necessary in order to bring us back from the
brink and stop this slippage, then it's going to
have to do research that is current. Courts are
not going to look well at data that's based on
databases four, five, six years old. So this
always has to be examined again and again.
Otherwise, there just won't be the record.

We just went through eight years with no research, or even longitudinal databases on minority ownership and EEO got cut off. A huge

bit of wealth that the Commission had - gone.

Because someone decided in the Science Office, of all places, that it wasn't important to keep track of science any more. Yeah, I said it.

Thank goodness that's no longer the case here. But we have to institutionalize this by doing this regularly. Whenever there's a Quadrennial, this ought to be studied.

It's going to cost some money. Please spend it.

MR. REED: And I don't want to spend too much time on this, but in terms of what the agency has to do, what the Commission has to do to design the types of studies that are going to be effective going forward, you know, going back to the transportation context, which has been fairly aggressive — DOT has been fairly aggressive at promoting diversity studies. And, of course, the case law in that area has suggested that state by state diversity studies have to be done, one, measuring capacity, and that is the level of minority and female ownership in those particular

jurisdictions that have the ability to do the type of work. And then looking at the history of barriers in that particular jurisdiction.

I mean, what are all of your thoughts on how we should be designing studies that will equip us to face Constitutional attack?

MR. HONIG: Well, the relevant market for broadcasting is national. Broadcast employment is national. People don't work in one community all their life. The average radio station runs through 55 percent job turnover in a year. Television, what is it? About 40, 45 percent?

And especially after consolidation, if you lose your job somewhere, there may be only four or five other places you can go for a job, so you have to move.

So, I'm very confident -- and I know some of those studies in the transportation area where, you know, people really do work in construction in one city at one time. But if you're going to work in the radio and television

industry, it's national, and I'm pretty confident the court will realize that.

MS. BAUTISTA: Can I add on that studies -- we're going to have a national broadband plan study. We're launching that in February 19, here in Washington, D.C. Because we looked at one study, it was like -- you know, like he said, eight years ago, a study about Asian community.

Well, they forgot about the Hmong, the Cambodian, the Laotian, the Filipino. They were just worried about the Chinese and the Japanese. And, you know, because of the sub-ethnic groups.

So, I said, we've got to do a really good study. So we're going to be doing that and really understand what's this national broadband, this plan, this media ownership. They don't even know what net-neutrality, they don't know how to spell net-neutrality, and then they read it all the time.

So I think the real study is getting the survey, finding out from different groups of people -- from the students, you know, Korea,

Philippines. I think they're more high-tech than the United States. I think we're the eighth or the -- the United States is low in technology.

So you can learn more from the Asians. For example, we're getting students to teach their grandpas, their uncles and aunties. Because when we do this foreclosure prevention counseling, they just say, "Oh, e-mail it to my kids so we can understand it."

So, I mean, we need to have really good study by asking the people, and different ethnic groups. And I think FCC can really take the leadership on that one.

MR. REED: Sylvia?

MS. STROBEL: Just piggy-backing on what my colleagues have just said, too, on the national front -- aside from the employment, when you're looking to be an owner, you're generally looking at a national group of stations to potentially purchase. You're rarely, if ever, going to find anything in your own backyard.

So, I mean, it's truly a national

1 process. And having been through the process of 2 looking at buying stations in the past, you're 3 looking all over the country, you're evaluating 4 those stations, and you're working with brokers, 5 banks and equity firms that are based all over the 6 country, too. So it's truly a national process. 7 MR. REED: Mm-hmm. You mentioned 8 "brokers, banks and equity firms." 9 Access to capital. 10 MS. STROBEL: Mm-hmm. 11 MR. REED: And sort of bringing this 12 back around to our ownership rules. 13 What, if anything, should we be doing or looking at with respect to the ownership rules 14 15 that will impact that issue, access to capital? MS. STROBEL: You know, I've been 16 17 mulling this question over, because I'm not sure 18 it's so much a rules issue as it is an education 19 issue, particularly where the capital markets are 20 concerned. I think there are a lot of folks in the 21 22 broadcasting industry, including some big media

companies, that would love to come to the table and find some solutions for diversifying the industry, including in the ownership ranks.

1.3

Where I think we've seen a lot of frustration is in working with the banks and equity firms, and angel investors, because the broadcast model, just overall, no longer fits within their portfolio. And furthermore, if you're looking at folks who are trying to buy small-market stations -- you know, \$2-, \$3-, \$4 million for a station -- they're too far under the financial requirements of most of these big national banks and equity firms, which require a \$50 million deal or above.

So we're looking at, I think, a couple of things that really relate to the access to capital. It's education -- educating banks and investment firms on the broadcasting industry. It's not the dot-com industry. That doesn't mean that it doesn't have incredible value and revenue potential. So I think education is key.

But certainly, where the rules are

concerned, if there are opportunities to work
within the current broadcasting communities to
come up with some solutions and suggestions and
incentives that allow for those entities to
provide financing, whether it be an incubator
model or some kind of vendor financing or more
seller financing, I think that would definitely
provide an opportunity for more ownership.

MR. ROBERTS: I'd like to reiterate again one of my points about diversity of ownership internationally. Because financial resources would be one of the primary generating factors for us to look beyond our shores to get financing to make further acquisitions.

But without going off-shore, let's sort of come back to Washington, D.C., just for a moment.

The Small Business Administration has loan guarantees with banks. Historically, the FCC would not allow for there to be an SBA guarantee, because the theory would be that if there is a recovery of that license, foreclosure -- whatever

you want to call it -- that then the SBA would then be the owner of a license issued by the FCC.

7.4

I think if we take a hard look at that scenario, and throw a little support behind SBA, who's not been the most successful entity for many of us in small businesses. And if somehow we could blend an intergovernmental discussion to allow for there to be some form of guarantee to a loan for minority and women-owned businesses, who are licensees, of course, that may be a little step outside of the traditional way of thinking, and the way government has run in the past.

MR. REED: On a related point -- private equity. Terry Jones sat on a panel here not too long ago, CO of Syncom, and indicated - he was heavily invested in broadcast properties years ago, and stated pretty squarely that he no longer does.

Is it a trickle effect? If we sort of push some of the measures that you're suggesting, will that be a part of attracting private equity funds back? Or is that money just gone?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, let's prepare, if you will for a moment a model or a case to a bank. All right. Now, if they're able to get a certain percentage guaranteed, the other side of that is how are they going to get paid back.

Now, one of the things that

Congresswoman Maxine Waters has been proposing,

based on some discussions I've had with her, is

let's take a look at the dollars spent in

broadcast media by the Federal government, whether

it's the Army, the Navy, or anyone else.

There's large -- there's a very significant amount of money spent in the advertising space with TV and radio. The question is, could you begin to create an interagency relationship that would, for lack of better terms, create a set-aside that would allow for dollars to be spent with your licensees who happen to be minority or women, and that then will create some of the support that you need to build your case before a bank or private investors? Because if they can see that there's a reasonable cash flow,

and you're buying a station that is under water, and it's under water because it hasn't been able to sell or do a good job of bringing revenue in.

But if you could create this new, unusual stream of revenue, through government purchases, into that licensee, upon acquisition, or for those of us who are still out here trying to make it, to give us that type of shot in the arm, I think it could be quite rewarding, and it could take you down the path of being able to get the financing that you needed, because you'll show the revenue potential to pay off the debt.

MR. REED: Any other comments on that? David? Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. BAUTISTA: I just want to add that there is no financing for small businesses, so, let alone, the broadcast industry. It's so frustrating for small businesses. They create an ARC business, you know, the ARC loans. Then businesses go in there, banks are not participating.

So I have a recommendation that we

should get some of that stimulus money.

You know, President Obama located billions in new energy programs, education programs and other programs of high priority. We should think of one-billion program that encourages venture capital.

MR. HONIG: Most of the initiatives the Commission could and should undertake don't happen to be before the Commission in this docket. But that doesn't mean that they're not important.

In this docket, there really are two things -- which we've spoken of already -- one of them being, you know, this longstanding proposal for incubators and waivers. Maybe the 20th year will be the charm.

And the other is the foreign ownership rules. We've seen some bump-up from the relaxation of EDP two years ago. But people ought to remember that much of the culture we have in this country is world culture now.

There are great opportunities for American broadcasters, and especially minority

broadcasters, to develop platforms overseas. But they can't do that because of what we all know is called "reciprocity." Since we have these restrictions on their investors and their banks and their operators' getting in here, they impose commensurate restrictions on us.

And the way to get them to relax those restrictions so that American broadcasters can go overseas is for us to come to them and relax our rules, too.

enacted, the earlier version, in 1912, we were perhaps understandably afraid that the Kaiser was going to come in and control our new radio business. Right now, we have the most secure, powerful radio and television business in the world. There's no chance whatsoever that foreign governments are going to come in and take over our media. It's absurd. That justification went out the window 50 years ago.

And yet there's still someone that will always fear that we're going to have -- I don't

know, what, xenophobia, or whatever. But we ought 1 2 to just call it what it is and say it's more 3 important now to just stand up and say, "We've got 4 to give our entrepreneurs access to foreign 5 markets. We've got to give people who want to 6 write checks from overseas to here, to help our 7 broadcasters grow, to do that." 8 We just have to stand up and have some 9 backbone and say that. Look, we've lost 50 percent of 1.0 11

minority-owned television stations in just the last 10 years, since the duopoly changes in 1999. We've lost 9 percent of commercial minority-owned radio in just the last 2 years.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Who's going to turn the lights out when the last minority broadcaster leaves the room?

Unless we do something urgently about it right now.

MR. ROBERTS: Let me just add, I like the concept of the stimulus money. So I'm going to suggest a route for you: Establish about a billion-dollar fund; place it in the hands of

1 community banks; and earmark it for minority- and 2 women-owned acquisitions or expansion of current, 3 existing FCC licenses. 4 MR. REED: I know you guys have been 5 listening to my voice a lot. I've gotten no 6 questions from the audience. 7 But I think somebody's going to be 8 coming around with cards, and I'll -- we can have 9 those questions issued. Just let them know -- put 10 your name on it, as well. 11 So, I think Jennifer has a couple 12 questions. But I just wanted to remind folks that 13 you can. 14 SPEAKER: (inaudible) MR. REED: Oh, okay. Well, then jump on 15 16 in. 17 MR. LEVENTHAL: (inaudible) my name's 18 Normal Leventhal. And --19 MR. REED: Hold on one second. We want 20 to get you a microphone so we can make sure it's 21 on the record. I don't know that -- that's 22 probably why we need the cards, because we need it